

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/697,086	OKADA, KAZUO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matthew D. Hoel	3714	

**All Participants:**

- (1) Matthew D. Hoel, examiner.
- (2) Carl Schaukowitch, attorney.

**Status of Application:** allowed

- (3) \_\_\_\_\_
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 29 November 2006
**Time:** P.M.
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic
- ☐ Video Conference
- ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*n/a*

Claims discussed:

*ind. clms. 1, 4.*

Prior art documents discussed:

*Ozaki ('658), Niyama ('182).*

**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*Proposed examiner's amendment to allow case. Mr. Schaukowitch called later indicating that the proposed amendments were acceptable and faxed in the claims including the proposed amendments on Dec. 12<sup>th</sup>, 2006.*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)